Claims 1-12 and 14-36 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 3-5, 14-17, 19-21, 31, 32, 34, and 36 are amended. No claim is canceled or added. Claims 1-12 and 14-36 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Applicant thanks the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses the Examiner's comments below.

### Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In paragraphs 3 through 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8-10, 17-19, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0020913 to Doganata et al. (Doganata) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120456 to Berg et al. (Berg), and over Doganata in view of U.S. Patent No. 7054860 to Inaba et al. (Inaba); the Examiner also rejected claims 4-7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046311 to Baidya et al. (Baidya), and over Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya; the Examiner also rejected claims 29 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7082428 to Denny et al. (Denny), and over Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny; the Examiner also rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0267813 to Rivers-Moore et al. (Rivers-Moore), and over Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Rivers-Moore; the Examiner also rejected claims 12, 16, 28, and 32 under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0010150 to Shaath et al. (Shaath), and over Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Shaath. This discussion combines these rejections in order to simplify the issues.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite the following:

A method comprising:

(a)      receiving a search query;

(b)      determining whether the search query has been previously received;

(c)      if the search query has been previously received,

      (i)      retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query, the previously stored result set comprising a plurality of categories each of which comprising one or more articles, and

      **(ii)      determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query; and**

**(d)      if the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query.**

(Emphasis added)

Support for claim amendments for claim 1 can be found in, for example, paragraphs [0062] and [0064] of the specification. As amended, claim 1 recites a method that determines whether at least one of a plurality of categories of a previously stored result set associated with a received search query is valid, and if so returns the category as a search result of the search query. This technique is useful, for example in providing offline searches.

Doganata, among other differences, fails to disclose "determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search

query is a valid search result set for the search query" (claim limitation (c)(ii)) and if so outputting the category as a search result of the search query (claim limitation (d)). Doganata, in contrast, discloses techniques for automatically selecting information sources that are most relevant to user queries. See Doganata, Abstract. The Doganata system allows a user query to be categorized into a number of categories, where each category is associated with a ranked list of information sources. See Doganata, paragraph [0020]. The Doganata system identifies a category for a user query and uses a ranked list of information sources associated with the category to search for and rank the result of the user query. The Examiner properly acknowledged that Doganata fails to disclose claim limitations (c)(ii) and (d) as previously recited. Applicant submits that Doganata also fails to disclose claim limitations (c)(ii) and (d) as amended since they recite additional limitations (determining validity of at least one of a plurality of categories of the previously stored result set, and if valid then output the category as a search result) that are not disclosed in Doganata.

Berg similarly fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations not disclosed by Doganata. Berg teaches a method for locating and recording time-limited signal sequences in media channels that may contain undesirable signal components. See Berg, Abstract. When a song is first detected in a radio transmission, a section of the media signal carrying the song is selected as a search key that identifies the song. See Berg, paragraph [0023]. When the song is played again at a later time, the search key is used to identify this recurrence. See Berg, Fig. 2, paragraph [0031]. The two signals of the same song are then compared and selectively merged to generate a copy of the song with less undesirable components. See Berg, Fig. 3, paragraph [0037].

The Examiner cited paragraph [0033] of Berg for disclosing claimed limitations (c)(ii) and (d) as previously presented. Paragraph [0033] of Berg discloses that two media signals of a song are compared and selectively merged to generate a copy of the song with less undesirable components, and does not teach or disclose determining whether at least a portion of a previously stored result set associated with a received search query is valid, and if so returning the portion as a search result of the search query. Assuming only for the sake of argument that the search key in Berg is equivalent to the claimed search query, a point Applicant does not concede, Berg only teaches using the search key to detect recurrence of a previously recorded signal sequence. Therefore, Berg fails to teach or suggest claim limitations (c)(ii) and (d) of claim 1 as amended.

Inaba similarly fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations not disclosed by Doganata. Inaba teaches a method to modify a searching profile on the basis of a user's evaluation of a search result. See Inaba, Abstract. The searching profile and corresponding search result are stored in a search history table and can be subsequently recovered. See Inaba, col. 7, lines 12-17 (7:12-17).

The Examiner cited 5:3-5, 6:31-52, 6:63-7:57, and Figures 1 and 16 of Inaba for disclosing claimed limitations (c)(ii) and (d) as previously presented. The cited sections disclose that a user can restore a previous searching profile and as a result a corresponding previous search result is displayed. However, Inaba is silent as to "determining whether at least *one of the plurality of categories* of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query" (emphasis added) and if so outputting the category as a search result of the query. Therefore, Inaba fails to teach or suggest claim limitations (c)(ii) and (d) of claim 1 as amended.

Baidya, Denny, Rivers-Moore, and Shaath also fail to disclose the claimed elements not taught by Doganata, Berg, and Inaba. Baidya discloses a system that crawls the Internet for web sites, extracts URLs from web sites, categorizes the web sites and URLs, and conducts user search queries that search a subset of the web sites and URLs based on the category information. See Baidya, Abstract Summary, paragraphs [0013], [0019] and [0020]. Denny discloses a system and method for collaborative searching. Denny's system receives search queries in a query server, which stores previously executed queries and corresponding results in a database. Subsequent search queries are compared to the stored queries in the query server. If a stored query is substantially similar to a subsequent query, Denny's system returns to the user the result corresponding to the stored query as the search result of the subsequent query. See Denny, col. 2, lines 3-11. Denny, however, does not discuss the use of categories as claimed. Rivers-Moore discloses a solution for a data file that enables a user to interact with data in the data file. See Rivers-Moore, Summary. The solutions are downloaded and stored locally. When a solution is needed, a unique special name for the solution identifier is computed to determine whether the solution is stored locally. If the solution is stored locally and up-to-date, Rivers-Moore's system uses the local solution, otherwise it downloads the solution from online. See Rivers-Moore, paragraphs [0079-0105], and Fig. 7. Shaath discloses a method and system for managing a file, including determining an expiration date and a minimum lifespan for the file, and deleting the file when expired. See Shaath, paragraphs [0102-0104], and Fig. 6. None of Baidya, Denny, Rivers-Moore, and Shaath discloses determining whether at least one of a plurality of categories of a previously stored result set of a search query is valid and if so outputting the

category as a search result of the search query, as recited in claim limitations (c)(ii) and (d) of amended claim 1.

In view of the above, Doganata, Berg, Inaba, Baidya, Denny, Rivers-Moore, and Shaath, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1 as amended. Thus, independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over the cited references. Independent claim 17 and 34 and dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited reference and requests that the application be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

<div style="text-align:center">

Respectfully Submitted,
Mihai Florin Ionescu

</div>

Date: __December 1, 2008__    By:    __/Jie Zhang/_____

Jie Zhang, Reg. No. 60,242
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA  94041
Tel.:  (650) 335-7297
Fax:  (650) 938-5200